

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY - REVISED

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)

DATE: OCTOBER 5, 2004

TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.

LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, THE YAHARA ROOM, ROOM 122

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Patricia Carlson (a DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

DET Governance:

- Michelle Eldridge (DET Domain Manager Team Lead)
- Molly Conroy (DET Governance Support Staff)

DET Development and Operations:

- Phil Schwarz (DET Operations Representative)

DET Infrastructure and Networks:

- Erik Mickelson (DET Infrastructure and Networks)

Keith Hazelton, Bud Borja, Mickey Crittenden, Michelle Eldridge, Phil Schwarz, Allen Poppe, and Erik Mickelson were absent from the meeting.

Agenda Items

1. Approval of September 21, 2004 Minutes
2. Review of Action Items and Updates
3. NASCIO
4. WEAT Recommendations
5. UW E-Business Student Project Team
6. WLIS Architectural Review

Action Items / Issues to Address

- Patricia will create a spreadsheet to categorize the principles and send it to WEAT for comment.
- Patricia will prepare to get the principles finalized at the next TLC meeting.
- Patricia will ask Matt to provide more information on his vision for an EA program in the state at the November TLC meeting.
- Patricia will ask Dana Perry to attend the next WEAT meeting to discuss how WEAT will interact with server consolidation.
- Patricia will revise the recommendation format to align with WEAT principles.

- The draft minutes from the August 24, 2004 meeting, the September 7, 2004 meeting, and the September 21 meeting need approval.
- The WEAT team will continue to work on the integration architecture framework.
- Patricia will begin to outline the WEAT business plan and send the updated charter.
- Patricia will provide WEAT an update of her status meetings with Matt.
- Molly will draft meeting minutes and provide them to WEAT for review.
- WEAT support staff will update the WEAT Web site with today's meeting documents.

Meeting Notes

1. Introduction to Meeting / Approval of Meeting Minutes

Patricia Carlson opened the meeting and requested deferral of the approval of the meeting minutes.

Action: *The approval of the draft minutes from the August 24, 2004 meeting, the September 7, 2004 meeting, and the September 21, 2004 meeting was deferred until the next meeting.*

2. Review of Action Items and Updates

Part of WEAT's initial task was to create balanced score cards to support the selection of technology within the enterprise. Initially, WEAT had two sub-groups developing components of these scorecards, namely "business/financial" and "technical".

The Office of Executive Budget and Finance will now be creating the "business/financial" portion of the IT balanced scorecard. This is part of an effort to standardize the way in which the business and finance issues for IT are viewed. An outcome that DOA hopes to achieve through this effort is a consistent way of determining of return on investment (ROI) for IT and the use master lease for IT projects.

David Schmiedicke and Matt Miszewski and other members of DOA executive management are involved in an agency-wide effort to implement metrics and performance measures. Scorecards that are developed by WEAT will need to be approved through Matt and Dave to ensure consistency with other DOA efforts.

3. National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO)

Patricia attended the NASCIO 2004 Annual Conference, September 19 - 22. She said it was a productive conference with a small ratio of vendors to state employees.

Patricia made several valuable contacts at the conference. Dan Combs is a project manager with the General Services Administration for the federal e-authentication initiative. He has looked at information from the Information Security and Privacy Domain, the WAMS work, and the WEAT/Server Domain recommendation for TIM/TAM. He would like to look at Wisconsin for a pilot for Federal e-authentication. He has also worked on the Iowa ROI investment methodology and has offered to speak with David Schmiedicke and Jenny Kraus.

The State of New Jersey has begun a pilot with the Federal Geospatial One-Stop and is using the One-Stop as a clearinghouse. The federal government is interested in helping set up a similar model in Wisconsin. The federal government wants to develop pilot agencies, so hopefully there will be no charges later, as, currently, there is no charge-back methodology in place.

Patricia made many contacts on enterprise architecture (EA). Eric Sweden, NASCIO's Enterprise Architect is working with a firm called Cyber on EA. WEAT should look at other states and leverage ideas from work already done. Federal EA offices are part of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the federal government is interested in having states use federal work for state EA. In talking to other state contacts working on EA, no other states are talking with local government units. Most

states are taking a view of looking at business areas, or communities of practice. Wisconsin is working on integration and standards and may be able to get a grant from NASCIO for \$60,000. This grant may be used to bring in consulting or use to jump start other EA efforts.

Senator Kanavas made a motion to look at an enterprise ERP system, which was part of the initial Enterprise Administrative Services Initiative (EASI). Arthur Stephens, the State of Pennsylvania Enterprise Architect, has offered to provide "lessons learned" and insights into ERP developments. He cautions against getting into customization of tools, which adds difficulty to making updates. ERP may be a recurring theme for WEAT. Some states have not had a return on standardized ERP.

The first conference keynote speaker, David Osborne, Author and Consultant, gave a presentation that was consistent with what has been released from other institutes. The government fiscal crisis is not going away and consolidation will keep happening. Conference attendees wanted to know more about bringing people to the table to talk about consolidation efforts.

The second keynote, Chris Warner, Founder, AMBER Alert Web Portal and Earth911, works with the integration of baseline systems. For example, GIS is used to map the location of a child abduction and communicate with law enforcement, and systems are integrated to send communication bulletins out to local government entities. The Engaging and Empowering Citizenship (E2C) group is looking for other ideas to use the baseline system. If someone has a good idea with a good business case this group may fund ideas to get up and running. Patricia thought of the Health Alert Network (HAN) for tracking contamination, biohazards, etc. Patricia will put Public Health Information Network (PHIN) staff in touch and check to see if it fits with agency business issues. Mr. Warner talked about building partnerships and bringing people together. For example, in terms of non-profit agencies, he stressed the need to bring in the largest last, showing that many smaller agencies were already participating. Patricia was impressed that the group was able to get grant money from ESRI and Oracle. It demonstrated a good infrastructure for handling project at this scale.

This information led to a discussion of WEAT's priorities and what needs to be accomplished. Judy Heil stated that WEAT is on a thirty-day timeline. This is based upon the initial business plan WEAT produced in May/June. Currently, WEAT is under no thirty-day timeline. Crowe Chizek will provide a recommendation on whether or not to move forward on server consolidation effort on October 18. A decision on this recommendation will lead to additional projects being formulated and moving forward. WEAT needs to evaluate criteria and work with server consolidation efforts. WEAT needs to either complete criteria or adopt models and adjust as needed. The EA needs to be consistent. Domains and other relevant technical working groups will be providing input to the criteria for the evaluation of a specific technology. Any recommendation, scorecard or other such evaluation will be based upon the WEAT principles. Where feasible and appropriate, WEAT will strive to provide joint recommendations with the domains and other relevant technical working groups.

Patricia asked WEAT to discuss whether or not the team had created too many principles and if the team should go back to the broad, general headings. The team discussed the need to reorganize the principles into categories. Potential categories include technical, philosophical, and organizational. Patricia will create a spreadsheet to help categorize the principles and send it to WEAT for comment.

A theme of some of the principles is for projects to demonstrate an ROI. The Iowa ROI model is proven and WEAT could review this model. A WEAT member asked if, in the absence of the Executive Budget model, WEAT could recommend using the Iowa model. Another WEAT member suggested that the process doesn't need a model. Patricia's comments on the State of Iowa model were with respect to the current process for submitting IT budget requests to the Executive Office of Budget and Finance, namely if we chose a consistent mechanism for these we would get more value from the process.

For example, projects that are components of server consolidation should have ROI. Crowe Chizek needs to demonstrate the ROI for server consolidation, but to do this, they need to do an in depth analysis with agencies. ROI information can determine the best path to take in consolidation. WEAT can provide industry best practices to the State CIO, Executive Budget, and the server consolidation staff, which can then be worked into the state budget process. WEAT should get buy-in from financial staff and then provide information to the server consolidation staff.

WEAT needs to determine a list of principles that can be used for projects. Scoring and weighting are difficult. A WEAT member suggested distributing a list of principles to agencies for feedback on importance. WEAT should determine some kind of scoring criteria. The current perception is that WEAT is making technical decisions. With scoring in place, WEAT can show that it is evaluating technical recommendations and scoring against WEAT principles.

To clarify WEAT's role in governance, WEAT needs to communicate with the other governance bodies. WEAT needs to come to the Technology Leadership Council (TLC) meetings and present recommendations and context. The tentative decision process flow should involve the domains. WEAT needs to get some process in place and domain involvement will help. With the question on maintaining the current domain structure, the process can be informal. WEAT also needs to have discussions with other governance bodies as a productive way to get issues on the table and talk through them. These meetings should have minutes drafted for each one to record the context to decisions. In addition, there should be better synching of the recommendation format to WEAT principles to show that recommendations made align with principles. With the misunderstanding of WEAT's role in the governance structure, more communication needs to occur to create a better understanding of WEAT roles. Reorganizing the principles will create an opportunity to talk about them and allow for more outreach to agency CIOs and staff.

At the next TLC meeting, WEAT would like to get comments on the principles. After the principles are finalized, WEAT will be able to work toward alignment with the server consolidation project. The next step is to score against principles without weighting. If the weighting is left to Matt and other decision-makers, weighted principles will emerge. Each decision is a "brick" in the reference model. An option is for WEAT to create succinct text for each principle and rate decisions on alignment with each principle.

WEAT doesn't determine business drivers; its role is to develop principles to create body of guidance for making technical decisions. The draft process is that a recommendation would go to the domains (or the body with technical expertise) and, using principles, the domain would look at a technology to solve a business problem. The domain would create a score and bring their evaluation to WEAT for evaluation. This process creates an evaluation of technology and WEAT ensures that bodies making technical decisions do so according to principles. A WEAT member asked if WEAT can use processes informally until the team gets vision from Matt. Gina Frank-Reese, DOA Deputy Secretary, will be doing higher-level business work and DOA is creating a statewide strategic plan. This will create a business architecture and additional context.

WEAT began a discussion of Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and Department of Transportation (DOT) architecture and standardization. DWD does a variety of scoring, grading criteria based on best practices. DWD has people in specific roles to do scoring: administration, business, financial, and technical people. The final number comes from a diverse set of interests. If scoring is different with one member of the scoring group, the group sits down to discuss it. DWD uses scorecards consistently and discussion occurs in front of executives. The scoring team needs to be able to score as objectively as possible.

WEAT will start with a paragraph of evaluation and score from there. It is likely that other parties will suggest WEAT assign numbers, and from there, the process will occur organically. It was suggested that WEAT use a "score" of + (highly aligns), 0 (neutral) or - (does not align) to introduce the concept of scoring, without using actual numbers to focus on key issues.

A WEAT member suggested the team review the current enterprise standards and revisit the standards in terms of server consolidation. Diane was asked if she could share the DWD standards for a consolidated environment. A WEAT member suggested letting server consolidation drive standards and see if standards need to be changed at that point. An in-depth analysis of what agencies have is key to revisiting the standards. WEAT can provide guidance on making technical decisions, but the enterprise needs an agency group to work on standards, etc.

A WEAT member requested a central place to put these decisions and as they accumulate. Agency staff need to know where to look for them. These decisions will create substance for a reference model. WEAT will make a recommendation to pull together standards and guidelines.

DOA is looking at project management toolsets, and the Department of Revenue (DOR) has in-house tools that may be brought over. DOA also has a Forrester analysis of toolset products. DOA has been working with Stephen Newell, IBM, and is waiting for info on the IBM environment. The value in live documents in the IBM demo is that things are viewed real-time in an on-demand environment, which generates more interest in this kind of tool to reduce regeneration of static documents. A WEAT member suggested DOA also talk to DOT engineers. A WEAT suggestion was for the vendor tool to be separated from process already in place. It was indicated that there will be money in the biennial budget to purchase a toolset and funding is being discussed.

Action: *Patricia will create a spreadsheet to categorize the principles and send it out for comment.*

Patricia will prepare to get the principles finalized at the next TLC meeting.

Patricia will ask Matt to provide more information on his vision for an EA program in the state at the November TLC meeting.

Patricia will ask Dana Perry to attend the next WEAT meeting to discuss how WEAT will interact with server consolidation.

4. WEAT Recommendations

WEAT members had a discussion about recommendations the team has made. Someone contacted a vendor after WEAT's recommendation on primary and secondary UNIX types. Patricia is currently working with DOA legal counsel on vendor disputes. Patricia will be working on recommendation formats and will revise past recommendations and bring them back to WEAT to make sure recommendations are viable in a legal situation.

In previous situations, agencies had purchase contracts, and purchases were just a choice based on available contracts. Now, with a decision to have two primary UNIX flavors, this is a new way of doing things. WEAT will need to format recommendations for any potential legal contests to be defensible to vendor challenges.

Previous state standardization efforts were less challenging. When the state standardized on Microsoft there weren't many other choices, so there wasn't much legal action. The desktop procurement had some legal action, but staff were able to point to language in the procurement that excluded the particular vendor response. When the state was looking at switches and routers, reviewers were able to narrow vendors to limited choices within just a few meetings.

In addition, anytime a WEAT recommendation is made, Patricia will attend the Bureau of Development and Operations staff meetings to present the recommendation to prevent confusion.

Action: *Patricia will revise the recommendation format to align with WEAT principles.*

5. WLIS Architectural Review

The Wisconsin Land Information System (WLIS) is envisioned as a statewide, web-based, distributed land information access system. It was created through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between DOA, the Department of Electronic Government (DEG) and DNR. DOA's land information provided funding for DNR to look at land information around the state. WEAT will be doing an architectural review of the system, including how it compares to the Federal Geospatial One-stop. WEAT will determine if WLIS should continue to develop and whether or not to integrate it with the Geo-spatial One-stop. WEAT members will have to talk to business staff for a business value proposition before looking at technical considerations. Discussion of consolidating land information bodies to a single entity is ongoing. It is likely that WEAT will need a project plan to go with the architectural review. Anne Iwata will probably coordinate the review and map out a strategy. This has the potential to lead to

many philosophical discussions on the value of GIS with many viewpoints to manage. This architectural review will determine how to direct resources and options for how to proceed.

The WEAT meeting was then adjourned.

The next meeting is Tuesday, October 19, 8:30 to 12:30 in room 7A.

#